

Senator Lamb, but I'm not afraid to vote for 169. I'm not afraid to take on the responsibilities because I have talked to my district and I brought up taxes at every meeting. I said, we may have to raise them. Which one do you want raised, sales tax or income tax? And they said, sales tax, leave our income tax alone, so I have even put a bill in to split that. The people understand if you go out and sell your project and sell your idea and sell yourself and come up front with them and show what is going on. Political overtones, call it what you may. Tie it into other bills, say what you may. I think we should take 169, pass 169, take the responsibility. I am willing to take my share. Mr. President, I withdraw my motion. Thank you.

SPEAKER NICHOL: The motion is withdrawn. Do you have anything else, Mr. Clerk?

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Warner would move to return LB 169 to Select File for a specific amendment, that amendment being to strike the enacting clause.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Just following the format, Mr. President, but I am going to rise to speak in opposition to 169 and to express my reasons, too, because there has been a lot of things said. But I am not in support of 169, not because I am opposed to any change but I am opposed to this change and what I do advocate is a system that would open up the projections. There has been some attempts to move in that direction but certainly this bill will not cause that to be accomplished. It would take a great deal more refinement before that is accomplished. Secondly, I would support legislation where the Governor and the Legislature enacts a substantially new program that they also at that time accept the responsibility for the rate to fund those programs such as 522. We certainly know what the impact of that has been. But finally, most importantly, I oppose this change and in part because of what Senator Lamb has said and that is that I, too, believe that certainly in times of stress it is not a factor but in times of normal economy or if a slight bit of inflation occurs again, then I believe that more spending would be the result of this only for the reason that unless you have a Board of Equalization that could meet prior to the session to adjust the rates that the economy is generating more money than is anticipated, we all know full well that the justification to use the additional money for whatever can and will be made and it will be on the assumption that this doesn't cost anything because we already have the money on hand.